

# The Primitive Republican.

F. G. BALDWIN,

OLD SERIES, VOL. X NO. 46.

COLUMBUS, MISSISSIPPI, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 28, 1852.

NEW SERIES, VOL. 3 NO. 29.

## THE REPUBLICAN.

Is published every Thursday Morning.  
Office on the South East corner of Main and St. John Streets, immediately above the Grocery Store of JACOB ISAACS.

TERMS:  
THREE DOLLARS a year in advance  
excepting Town subscribers, who will be charged \$3.50 when payment is delayed six months, and \$4.00 if not paid until the end of the year.

RATES OF ADVERTISING.  
One Dollar a square for first insertion; and 50 Cents a square for each continuation. Ten lines or less constitute a square.  
Professional Cards a square \$10.00.  
For less time \$1.25 per month.  
Professional Cards published & paper furnished one year for \$12.00.

ADVERTISEMENTS for 15 lines charged at the discretion of the Publisher.  
All communications addressed to the Editor must be post paid, in order to insure attention.

JOE PRINTING  
Of all kinds NEATLY and PROMPTLY executed.  
BLANKS  
For Sheriff's, Magistrates, Constables, Clerks, &c. furnished at shortest notice, from \$1.25 to \$1.50 a quire according to quality.

SOCIETIES IN LOWDES COUNTY.



MASONIC.  
COLUMBUS LODGE, No. 5.  
S. S. Franklin, W. M. | N. E. Goodwin, Sec'y.  
Meets at Columbus, on the 1st Friday of each month.

COLUMBUS LODGE, No. 114.  
A. W. Johnson, W. M. | O. T. Foster, Sec'y.  
Meets at Columbus, on the 3rd Friday of each month.

DANVILLE LODGE, No. 144.  
Scott T. Jones, W. M. | Richard Scott, Sec'y.  
Meets at Danville, on the 3rd Saturday of each month.

COLUMBUS R. A. CHAPTER, No. 4.  
C. H. Abbott, H. P. | N. E. Goodwin, Sec'y.  
Meets at Columbus, on the 1st Monday after 1st Friday of each month.

I. O. O. F.  
COLUMBUS LODGE, No. 20.  
H. L. Bailey, W. M. | T. H. Williams, Sec'y.  
Meets at Columbus, every Saturday night.

McKENNEDY LODGE, No. 32.  
Dand Williams, N. G. | N. N. Davis, Sec'y.  
Meets at Columbus, every Monday night.

FRANKLIN LODGE, No. 38.  
M. R. Goodwin, N. G. | W. Downing, Sec'y.  
Meets at Columbus, every Friday night.

FRANKLIN LODGE, No. 6.  
H. L. Bailey, C. P. | H. H. Scott, Sec'y.  
Meets at Columbus, on the 1st and 3rd Tuesdays in each month.

S. C. T.  
COLUMBUS DIVISION, No. 9, Sons of Temperance.  
Held at Temperance Hall at Columbus, every Tuesday evening at 7 o'clock.

DR. J. BROWN RIGG,  
HAS removed to the well known office formerly occupied by Dr. Logan, opposite Pope's Hotel, where he may be found, ready to attend promptly to professional calls in Columbus, and to the surrounding country.  
Columbus, Miss. Jan. 1st, 1852. 44-1y.

HENRY, STODDART & CO.  
WHOLESALE & RETAIL DEALERS IN  
LUGGAGE,  
BOOTS AND SHOES,  
Corner Central Water St., Mobile, Ala.  
Jas. Hays, ALEX. STODDART,  
J. W. PIERCE, JAMES TAIT.

We would respectfully call the attention of Planters, Traders and citizens generally, to our *Fragrant* and *Exquisite* articles, which have been selected with the greatest care, and are of the highest quality, and most durable.

We are also prepared to furnish to the Trade, every style of Goods in our line, at satisfactory prices, and would respectfully solicit orders.  
Oct. 2nd, 1852. 24-6m.

HENRY & CO.,  
Importers and Dealers in Foreign and Domestic Dry Goods.

Corner Central Water St., Mobile, Ala.  
Jas. Hays, ALEX. STODDART,  
J. W. PIERCE, JAMES TAIT.

We would respectfully call the attention of Planters, Traders and citizens generally, to our *Fragrant* and *Exquisite* articles, which have been selected with the greatest care, and are of the highest quality, and most durable.

We are also prepared to furnish to the Trade, every style of Goods in our line, at satisfactory prices, and would respectfully solicit orders.  
Oct. 2nd, 1852. 24-6m.

HENRY & CO.,  
Importers and Dealers in Foreign and Domestic Dry Goods.

Corner Central Water St., Mobile, Ala.  
Jas. Hays, ALEX. STODDART,  
J. W. PIERCE, JAMES TAIT.

We would respectfully call the attention of Planters, Traders and citizens generally, to our *Fragrant* and *Exquisite* articles, which have been selected with the greatest care, and are of the highest quality, and most durable.

We are also prepared to furnish to the Trade, every style of Goods in our line, at satisfactory prices, and would respectfully solicit orders.  
Oct. 2nd, 1852. 24-6m.

HENRY & CO.,  
Importers and Dealers in Foreign and Domestic Dry Goods.

Corner Central Water St., Mobile, Ala.  
Jas. Hays, ALEX. STODDART,  
J. W. PIERCE, JAMES TAIT.

We would respectfully call the attention of Planters, Traders and citizens generally, to our *Fragrant* and *Exquisite* articles, which have been selected with the greatest care, and are of the highest quality, and most durable.

We are also prepared to furnish to the Trade, every style of Goods in our line, at satisfactory prices, and would respectfully solicit orders.  
Oct. 2nd, 1852. 24-6m.

HENRY & CO.,  
Importers and Dealers in Foreign and Domestic Dry Goods.

Corner Central Water St., Mobile, Ala.  
Jas. Hays, ALEX. STODDART,  
J. W. PIERCE, JAMES TAIT.

We would respectfully call the attention of Planters, Traders and citizens generally, to our *Fragrant* and *Exquisite* articles, which have been selected with the greatest care, and are of the highest quality, and most durable.

We are also prepared to furnish to the Trade, every style of Goods in our line, at satisfactory prices, and would respectfully solicit orders.  
Oct. 2nd, 1852. 24-6m.

HENRY & CO.,  
Importers and Dealers in Foreign and Domestic Dry Goods.

Corner Central Water St., Mobile, Ala.  
Jas. Hays, ALEX. STODDART,  
J. W. PIERCE, JAMES TAIT.

We would respectfully call the attention of Planters, Traders and citizens generally, to our *Fragrant* and *Exquisite* articles, which have been selected with the greatest care, and are of the highest quality, and most durable.

We are also prepared to furnish to the Trade, every style of Goods in our line, at satisfactory prices, and would respectfully solicit orders.  
Oct. 2nd, 1852. 24-6m.

HENRY & CO.,  
Importers and Dealers in Foreign and Domestic Dry Goods.

The letter of the Hon. T. L. Clingman, one of the *Whig* representatives in Congress from the strongest *Whig* district in the State of North Carolina, presents some points to which the attention of the country should be especially directed. It must be borne in mind, that Mr. Clingman has been for many years foremost among the *Whig* leaders of the House of Representatives; that he was not among the number of original *Whig* Representatives—such as Toombs and Stephens of Georgia, Gentry and Williams of Tennessee, White and Abernethy of Alabama, Faulkner of Virginia, and Senator Walter Brooke of Mississippi; all prominent & distinguished Southern *Whigs*—good and true, who refused to support General Scott; that in determining to oppose him, he does not act from impulse nor from a partial survey of the issues and principles involved in the canvass, but from a clear perception of its tendency as developed at this late hour of the struggle; that he preferred the nomination of Taylor; and that he is familiar, not only with the character of Gen. Scott the soldier, but also with the character and principles of Gen. Scott the politician.

Thus biased towards him by personal and party prejudices, and thus familiar with his political relations and purposes, Mr. Clingman's protest against the election of Scott, will strike the public mind with peculiar force and emphasis.

Mr. Clingman asserts, that General Scott "has repeatedly expressed the opinion that he could be elected without a vote from a slave state." This is a verbal declaration of a fact, which his acts have already manifested with unmistakable emphasis; and that is, that General Scott has spurned the South and has thrown himself into the arms of the abolitionists relying solely upon their support to attain the presidency.

By the light of this declaration the consistency of Gen. Scott's conduct is manifest. His *Canada* declaration, his protest against the extension of southern soil, his refusal to give the south any promise to maintain its rights are all parts of the same system of fraternization with the abolitionists.

He thinks he can bid defiance to the "slave states," since he imagines he has secured the votes of the abolitionists by his many bids for their favor and support. Then come out on Tuesday, November the 2nd—remember the "betwixt and betwixt"—and vote against him and for Pierce and King.

But to the letter of Mr. Clingman, the staunch North Carolina *Whig*. Here it is:

LETTER FROM HON. T. L. CLINGMAN.  
RALEIGH, October 8, 1852.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your request I proceed briefly to state, in writing, the substance of my conversation with you in relation to the approaching presidential election. I do this the more readily, not only because I have no political opinions that I wish to conceal, but because, as one of my immediate constituents, you are entitled to have them in a form capable of preservation for future reference.

From the time of General Scott's nomination I have universally stated—in conversation with my colleagues, other members of Congress, and in fact all who felt an interest in knowing my views—that I did not intend to support General Scott. In reply, also to such letters as I received, asking for my opinion, I repeatedly wrote to the same effect—to gentlemen of both political parties, who were residents of my district, and also to some from other portions of the State. Several of these letters were written, soon after General Scott's nomination, to gentlemen of both parties canvassing for seats in the legislature. I mention this lest it should be charged that I hesitated to commit myself in writing, since it was easy for any one of these gentlemen—there being no injunction of secrecy on them—to have furnished evidence of my position. I did not think it expedient to make a public declaration of my position, partly because it was said by the papers friendly to General Scott that members of Congress ought not to attempt to dictate to the people, and in part, also, because I preferred giving my views to my constituents face to face, in a full and free manner, on my return to my district.

In 1848, seeing that the contest was likely to be between General Taylor and Gen. Scott, and that the former had refused to take any position with reference to the great pending questions of the day, and not being disposed to adopt him on trust, and blindly support him, I after a long waiting for a development of General Taylor's views, determined to advocate the nomination of General Scott rather than his. Since then I have had no reason to regret that course. As I apprehended and predicted, as soon as the policy of General Taylor's administration was developed with reference to the great slavery questions then pending, I in conjunction with a majority of the southern *Whig* members of Congress was thrown into opposition to it. Though such was the condition of things for several months before General Taylor's death, yet the public was not generally aware of it. His sudden demise prevented an open and violent collision. About the first of July 1850, it was determined, at a meeting of a decided majority of the southern *Whig* members of Congress, that it was our duty, before an open declaration of hostilities, to advise the then President of our poses, &c. Three gentlemen were selected for that purpose, to wit: the Hon. C. M. Conrad, the present Secretary of War, the Hon. Humphrey Marshall, of Kentucky, and the Hon. Robert Toombs, of Georgia. They, in accordance with the views of the meeting, separately called on the President, and gave him to understand that he must expect our determined opposition if he persisted in resisting such a compromise as we advocated, and insisted on his policy of admitting California and New Mexico as States, and supporting the claim of the letter to the

territory on this side of the Rio Grande. According to their several reports to us, Gen. Taylor was unyielding, and frankly declared to them, that as soon as the constitution of New Mexico reached him, which he looked for in a few days, he should send in a message to Congress recommending its admission as a State, as he had done in the case of California; that he also declared that Texas had no right to the territory claimed by her, and that he was disposed to support the claim of New Mexico against her. To one of these gentlemen, he said that he was placed in such a position that he would probably be forced to sacrifice one wing of his party; and that we ought not to expect him to sacrifice eighty-four men from the North rather than twenty-nine men from the South, these being the number of members of the northern and southern sections of the *Whig* party in Congress. The great body of the southern members of Congress, with Mr. Clay at their head, would have been thrown into opposition, and would have been compelled with the aid of the conservative men of the North, to fight the whole force of the administration. The death of General Taylor alone prevented a struggle which would have shaken the country to its centre. The decree of Providence thus averted the contest; but the lesson is one which ought not to be lost on us. Without however, going into detail on these points, I proceed at once to speak of General Scott.

In the summer of 1849 his *Canada* declaration letter was published. General Taylor having just been inaugurated, it seemed probable that he might be renominated for election, with the support, as it was then supposed of the whole South. It would be necessary to secure the northern vote in opposition to supersede him. General Scott, therefore while expressing his wish for the acquisition of Canada, voluntarily and without being questioned on the point, went on to declare his opposition to the acquisition of Mexican territory. In substance he said that while he was for taking territory that would strengthen the North, he was opposed to such acquisition as might in like manner keep the South even with the North. I then looked upon this as an open, undisguised declaration of his wish to be regarded as the northern presidential candidate. It could be considered in no other light than as a bid for northern support, at the expense, too, of our essential interests. During my journey through the northern States in the autumn of that year, I had other evidences to the same effect. I felt that Gen. Scott had not in the position he had voluntarily taken any claims on me or any other southern man. On the contrary, I saw that the rights of my section under the constitution as equals in the Union, had been put up for sale in the political market for anti-slavery votes. It was obvious that Gen. Scott believed he could be elected by northern votes alone. In fact, I have the best reason to believe that he, much more recently, than the time I refer to, repeatedly expressed the opinion that he could be elected without a vote from a slave State. For the last three years he has been identified with the anti-slavery party of the North; but in 1848, Mr. Seward, who is the leader of the party, was opposed to him. During the session of the *Whig* Convention at Philadelphia, in that year, I had some conferences with Mr. Thurlow Weed, the editor of the *Albany Evening Journal*, and with Mr. Horace Greeley, the editor of the *New York Tribune*, both of them being well known as intimate friends and mouth-pieces of Wm. H. Seward. They were utterly hostile to Gen. Scott and said he could not possibly be supported by them, on account of his nativism and various other points enumerated by them. Why is it that Mr. Seward and these gentlemen have since taken up General Scott and given him the nomination? Because they found him could make use of him to destroy *Mass. Fillmore*, *Webster*, and other friends of the *Compromise*; and they therefore seized upon him as a fitting instrument for that purpose. But it is said that he had in his private conversations expressed himself in favor of those measures. If it be true, it makes the case stronger against him. After the passage of the bill a fierce attack was made on those men at the North who had the liberality to assist in getting them through. Seward and his followers took the field to crush *Webster* and *Fillmore*. But while the storm of war was raging for their destruction, where was General Scott? As they were duty-bound to do, why did he not stand by them like a man? A sentence from his pen declaring his approbation of their course would have materially aided them. Though appealed to again and again he would not write it. On the contrary he allowed his name to be inscribed on the banners of his military glory that Seward and his clan fought the battle against our allies. Was such a proceeding fair and honorable on the part of Gen. Scott? Let me state a similar case for illustration. Suppose that, during his Mexican campaign, a portion of his army had, in accordance with his appointment, taken and occupied a dangerous position, which nevertheless it was necessary for the safety of the army should be taken; suppose, too, that when they had been fiercely assailed by Santa Anna and his armies, that Gen. Scott, though able to protect them, had stood aloof and allowed them to be destroyed; suppose, too, that he had, without objection permitted Santa Anna to carry his own banner, and fight them thus, in the name of General Scott, who ought rather to have protected them; and suppose, to crown all, that General Scott had then become the associate and triumphant leader of Santa Anna's party! To show that the cases are alike you have only to substitute *Fillmore* and *Webster* who took the extreme position for the *Compromise* with Gen. Scott's approbation; then put Seward, Johnston, and other abolitionists, for their assailants instead of Santa Anna and his followers. Under General Scott's banner and in his name they have fought and conquered our allies in the North; and General Scott takes the nomination from their hands. But it may be said that such a case as I have put could not have occurred—that General Scott as an honorable soldier, would not have so acted, and that he in fact, did refuse the presidency from the Mexicans. All this I admit. Gen. Scott, *de editor*, would not have so behaved; but in the field of politics has he not so acted? I agree that he has done so because he was entrapped by the politicians who were more cunning than he. Many of

his friends try to evade it by saying that though, under the influence of ambition, he acted wrong to get the nomination, yet he will do right if elected. But if Seward and company have had influence enough heretofore to keep him silent when it was his duty to have spoken, will they not have just as much influence after his election? Will they not threaten to abandon his administration? Will he not be forced to support just as Gen. Taylor did, determine as a military man, to sacrifice the small body from the South? And when we are pressed again, as we doubtless shall be, what northern man, either *Whig* or democrat will come to our relief? If we, *therefore*, sacrifice our friends and put in our enemies, what right have we to look for northern support again?

But it may be said that if we refuse to support Gen. Scott, Gen. Pierce will be elected. If he were a dangerous man there might be force in the objection. I have closely scrutinized his course since the beginning of the canvass. Upon all questions connected with slavery and the rights of the South, *man*, I know of, from any section of the Union, has a better record. While he has been, as far as I know, true to all the great essential interests of his own section, his votes and speeches prove him to have been eminently just and liberal to us. Since his retirement from Congress his course has been consistent and national. He was active in putting down, in the democratic party of N. Hampshire, John P. Hale, the abolition candidate for the Presidency. More recently he did the same with respect to Atwood. Mr. Atwood, a political and personal friend of Gen. Pierce, was the democratic nominee for governor. Shortly before the election, when there was every prospect of the success of Mr. Atwood—as his opponent, the *Whig* candidate, was like all the other *Whigs* of New Hampshire, hostile to the fugitive slave law—he likewise wrote a letter expressing his opposition to that measure. Gen. Pierce, being only then a private citizen, was under no particular obligation to interfere. He might, too, have said that both the candidates were merely standing on the same ground. Besides, neither he nor the people of New Hampshire had any practical interest in the fugitive slave law. It was there a mere question of justice to the South; and yet Gen. Pierce took it upon himself to travel some distance to see Mr. Atwood; and on his return to take back his letter, he commenced a movement which resulted in degrading Atwood from his position as the democratic candidate for governor, and in substituting a sound man in his place. It was thus that Gen. Pierce, a private citizen, under no especial obligation to take so much trouble and odium on himself, acted from a mere determination to do justice to the constitutional rights of the South. How does Gen. Scott's conduct compare with it? In Pennsylvania Gen. Scott was nominated for the Presidency by the same convention that nominated Gov. Johnston for election. But Gov. Johnston refused to sign a bill passed by the democratic legislature of Pennsylvania to facilitate the execution of the fugitive slave law, and was, in fact, avowedly hostile to that measure. Here, then, was a proper case for the interference of Gen. Scott, he being associated in the nomination of the convention with Johnston. Ought he not, in justice to himself, if he was a friend to the compromise, to have written at least a line vindicating his position? But, on the contrary, he was as mute as the grave, and the whole weight of his military popularity to the support of Johnston. And he was repaid by the exertions of Gov. Johnston, who, after his defeat by the democratic candidate, came to the convention at Baltimore and carried his election for General Scott.

But it is said that we were represented in the convention, and an therefore bound to support its nominee. Suppose it had nominated Fred Douglas, the free negro, the same argument might have been used. Should it be said that this is not supposable case, then would we not have been bound to support Mr. Seward, who will doubtless, if the south acquiesces and assists in election of Gen. Scott, be the next nominee?

If we are not bound to go for any nominee unless he is a proper person, is not this the time for us to make the stand? It is, however, said that allegiance to our party requires support of *its* ticket. It was Decatur's motto that one's country must be supported right or wrong; but are we to do the same by a party? The independent freemen of the section from which you and I come have not thought so. When Gen. Jackson was first elected he did not lose two hundred votes in his congressional district. But in 1840, when his party presented Martin Van Buren as a candidate for re-election, there was a majority of four thousand four hundred votes against him. That was an exhibition of independence worthy of American freemen, who ought always to prefer the interests of their country to mere party success.

If the *Whig* convention has now, as I think, wisely, under the circumstances, an unwarranted nomination, why not to re-evaluate it? I do not at present see any practical issue pending between the parties of sufficient magnitude to require us to sustain the *Whig* nominee at all hazards. All the *Whigs* appear to be satisfied with Mr. Fillmore's administration. And yet, since he came into office, there has been no new measure of a party character passed. The treasury, tariff, and other general laws, enacted in Mr. Polk's time, have not been changed. There is but one *thing* that Mr. Fillmore recommended change, viz: the tariff. With reference to that however, the legislature of our own State, with unanimity both among the *Whigs* and democrats, passed strong resolutions against any increase of duties. There seems fact, therefore, no reason to suppose that under Mr. Pierce, if he should come in, there would be any material change in these respects.

But it is said that he Van Burens and other free soilers are supporting Pierce. It must be remembered, however, that he was not nominated through their influence, but in direct opposition to them. It was the south, with the aid of the conservative democrats of the north, that effected his nomination. These free-soilers therefore, being overpowered, merely for the sake of keeping in with their party, fall into the rear of the movement. But in the case of Gen. Scott the reverse was true. He was nominated by the influence of Seward, Johnston, and other anti-slavery leaders, against the united and

determined efforts of the whole South and the compromise men of the north; and if we support him, we must expect to constitute a tail to the army of abolitionists in front. It may be said that as the Van Burens, &c., have yielded, we ought to follow their example. But they have in reality surrendered nothing practical, because they had no interest in this question. Their anti-slavery, if not merely taken up to defeat Cass, was at least only a fancy matter, and in giving it up they have only to sacrifice some pride of consistency. We of the South, on the contrary, have a practical interest—a great stake in the slavery question. Should we abandon it and throw ourselves into the embraces of the abolitionists, who from the North will be able to extricate us? I pass over, sir, many grave points of objection to Gen. Scott that have been urged by others, especially his contemptuous manner of slurring over the platform by "accepting the nomination, with the resolutions annexed." He not only fails to follow the example of Gen. Pierce by declaring that the principles meet his approval, but, inasmuch as there was a great pressure upon him to get him up or down, his language is ominous. Fairly construed, his language, under all the circumstances, only seems to imply that he liked the nomination so much that he was willing to take it, notwithstanding the objectionable resolutions tied on to it. So he construed throughout the North; and he must, when he wrote the words, have felt a contempt for our understandings if he thought we could put any other construction on them. I am sorry that his supporters, instead of endeavoring to meet these issues, are merely endeavoring to get up an excitement in relation to his military services by the exhibition of pictures, &c. Brilliant military services, like his, are a great feather in the cap of any man; but our people have not deemed them alone sufficient to qualify one for the presidential office, in despite of great political objections.

I make no reference to the personal charges against the candidates because they are unnecessarily and most unworthily made. Having known Gen. Scott for a great many years, it gives me pleasure to testify to his high moral worth and honorable qualities as a soldier and a man. Though I have never seen Gen. Pierce, yet all of those who served with him in Mexico, that I have met, concur in saying that no man there was more respected or more popular. The intelligence, courage, and high tone of that army forbid the idea that they would have held General Pierce in the estimation they did, if he had been deficient in any mainly or honorable quality. Those politicians, too, who have served with him in either house of Congress, as far as I have heard them speak, have expressed themselves invariably in the most favorable terms with respect to him.

I am well aware, sir, that the expression of these opinions may subject me to denunciation from some. If I had consulted only my personal convenience, I might well have fallen into the general current of the party. Not having in any way committed myself against Gen. Scott prior to his nomination, I might have claimed credit as an early supporter, and occupied, doubtless, a position in the front of his party. But I have done so, I would not have acted in accordance with my own sense of right. I have too often encountered opposition in the conscientious discharge of my duty to hesitate now.

If Franklin Pierce was willing to encounter storm of opposition and obloquy by opposing the strong abolition current of the north, as he did in putting down Atwood, merely to sustain the rights of a distant section of the Union, ought not you and I and others to be willing to make some sacrifices, if necessary, to maintain the great essential interests of our own section? When Gen. Scott received the nomination, was it not the general feeling of our people that he ought not to be supported? That was an honest, patriotic impulse. Under pressing solicitations and the influence of party prejudice, many have reluctantly yielded acquiescence. Is it not better, however, to consider the matter calmly, and act solely for the interest of the country? If Gen. Scott should be elected under all the existing circumstances, it not only consigns to their political graves forever *Fillmore* and *Webster* and other compromise *Whigs* of the north, but the defeat of Gen. Pierce will tend powerfully to deter any northern democrat from again standing up for our rights. This is what Seward and his followers are evidently seeking to accomplish. Ought we to aid them in such a movement, intended as it is solely to effect our political and social destruction? If not, under all the circumstances, believe that Franklin Pierce should be elected rather than Gen. Scott? By repudiating the nomination of the latter—by making it manifest that he was beaten, not merely because the democratic party was the strongest, but because also the conservative men of the country generally refused to support him—we may prevent the recurrence of a similar nomination by any future convention, and greatly contribute to insure the future quiet of the country.

I am, very respectfully, yours, &c.  
T. L. CLINGMAN.  
DR. LADSON A. MILLS.

A Thrilling Appeal.

The following trumpet-toned appeal, addressed by Com. Stockton to the great democratic meeting at Trenton on the 15th instant, is applicable everywhere:

"Democrats of New Jersey stand by your banner! Your war-worn, invincible banner—the banner of progress and reform—the world cheering banner, under which the alien law was expunged from your statute book, and equal rights and fraternity offered to the oppressed of all nations—your adopted and naturalized citizens will not desert it.

Democrats of New Jersey stand by your banner—that glorious banner under which Louisiana was brought into the Union; the Louisianians will not desert it. That banner under which California was conquered for the Union; the Californians will not desert it.

Democrats, everywhere, stand by your banner, that beloved banner under which our ever-to-be-cherished Union has thrice been saved from anarchy, dissolution and blood; the Union men will not desert it. All hail—the Union and the democratic party—one and inseparable.

From the Washington Union.

Democrats!

We have gained the victory of the 23d December, but the battle of the 8th of January is yet to be fought. Will you suffer yourselves to be seduced into apathy? or will you not nerve yourselves with additional vigor for the final struggle with your political opponents?

The wreath of triumph is now on your brow. This week sees you the victors of the field. You have carried the Keystone State, and the Empire State of the West. You have swept the State of Indiana. Do these trophies furnish any reason for overweening confidence in your success—for the slightest relaxation in your glorious efforts? Far from it. Your enemy has been beaten at three important points; but he is not yet subdued. We earnestly advise you to stand to your arms—to relax no preparation—to disband no man—but to bring every soldier to the field on the 2d November.

Do not despise your enemy too much.—He is determined in his purpose, and desperate in his means. His leaders are reckless, and will fight to the last. Look out for fresh stratagems and more shameless inventions. As the catastrophe approaches he will put forth every effort to strike you down. But all his blows and all his manoeuvres will be unavailing, if you continue to exert the energy which becomes your country and your cause.

You have to exert yourselves but for a little less than three weeks. Continue to address yourselves like men to the work which is before you, and all will be safe! But never fold your arms for one moment; and as you have been advised, organize yourselves, ARM, ACT, till the very last tap of the drum. We but repeat what we said a few days ago.

We shall in all human probability, obtain the victory, but we do not aspire to a common triumph. We want a victory which shall be brilliant in its character and overwhelming in its effects. We are not content with barely carrying the day. We shall not be satisfied with a meagre majority; we desire a majority so large and so astounding that its moral force shall tell to the remotest generation. We want this great people to rush to the polls in irresistible numbers, for their own sakes and for the sake of their children.

We wish to prostrate to the earth the dangerous principles which threaten the Constitution and the Union itself. We desire to scatter to the winds all the elements of faction and fanaticism which have so daringly disturbed the peace of our country.

We wish to break up the spirit of that military dynasty which has proved so fatal to so many republics.

We wish to bring in a race of tried and practical statesmen, who shall administer the government according to the true principles of the constitution.

We want to teach a lesson to the leaders of the *Whig* party which shall prevent a repetition of those humbugs and tricks which have so long insulted the people, disgraced the elective franchise, and even tarnished the fame of our country. It is high time to rebuke the means by which the *Whig* party have for so many elections sought to obtain the power which they have abused. Away with the double-dealing which has marked their electioneering—the double phases which they have presented to the north and the south—the double sets of documents which they have scattered among the voters of the two sections of the country—the disgraceful means by which their intriguing committee in this city are even now attempting to hold up Franklin Pierce as an abolitionist to the South, and the advocate of slavery to the North! Let an enlightened people rise up in the majesty of their strength and put down these disgraceful expedients forever and forever.

Above all, we hope they will turn out in all their force to silence the desperate efforts of the abolitionists. Let us teach these fanatics that they are striking in vain at our holy Union. Let us show by our votes that we are determined to stand by the *Compromise* and its determined and open friend.—Let us prevent all future agitation, knit the bonds of the confederacy more strongly together, and show to Seward and Johnston, and to every man who is co-operating with them, that whoever attempts to pollute the ark of the covenant will surely perish.

We appeal, therefore, to the people to arise in all their strength, and give such an overwhelming majority as will carry every thing before it.

The Approaching Election—The Candidates, Our Duty.

The time has now arrived when every freeman should arouse and prepare for the coming political contest, which is to determine the character of the Government for the next four years, and possibly for a much longer period. No man has a right to be neutral. We are under an obligation of duty to ourselves and our children, that we cannot avoid without proving recreant to the sovereign and inalienable rights with which our fathers invested us, for the benefit of our posterity. It is our duty to investigate the qualifications of the candidates for our suffrages, and the effect of their elections upon the institutions of the country, and the rights and liberties of the citizens.

The only candidates before the people who have any chance of election are Pierce and Scott. The contest is really between these two candidates and every vote given for other candidates or for any other than the regular

ticket is in reality a vote thrown away, and for all practical purposes, the men who give them have for the time being, disfranchised themselves, or what is worse, they have in effect, given half a vote to the candidate of the enemies of our institutions.

Let us now examine the qualifications of the candidates. Is Gen. Scott in any sense qualified to be President? In his youth he chose the profession of arms as a lifetime business, taking all the chances of war or peace for regular pay. The profession seems to have been adapted to his nature; but if not, then the principle is verified that "habitu becomes second nature." We need tell our readers that Gen. Scott, as a commander in the army from his youth, has necessarily been a Despot—his will being the law to the soldiers under him? Need we tell them that in accordance with this habit, acquired by a life of more than 40 years in the regular army, that Gen. Scott is imperious, dictatorial, self-willed, pompous, vain, self-conceited, proud, insolent to his equals or superiors, contemptuous to those who are under him, and entirely unfit to be entrusted with the civil administration of the Government of a free people? These habits or qualities of Gen. Scott are notorious. He has several times quarrelled with the Government, on account of insolence and disobedience of Orders; he has quarrelled with several of his Generals and with his men; he quarrelled with Clay, with Jackson, with Polk, with Marcy, with Adams, with Clinton and with nearly all the prominent men with whom he has had business relations. It is impossible in the nature of things for such a man to administer the Government with wisdom, justice or moderation.

But aside from these natural disqualifications, General Scott is a Federalist in the worst sense of the term. He advocates powers in the General Government wholly inconsistent with the reserved rights of the States. Among other heresies, he believes Congress has power to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia. His letters show that he was in favor of a National Bank, the Bankrupt Law, a virtual abolition of the Veto power, an extension of the term of office to six years, and other equally dangerous measures. But aside from all this, Gen. Scott was nominated against the almost unanimous wish of the South and is the favorite candidate of a set of Abolition fanatics who "excrete and spit upon" every platform and every pledge which is intended to secure the rights of the South.

Turning from this sad and truthful picture of the character and qualifications of Gen. Scott for the Presidency, we find in Gen. Pierce, his opponent, the following contrast: He is a States Rights man, and a Democratic Republican of the strictest sect. During a service of nine years in Congress on every question which involved constitutional questions, his vote is recorded in favor of a strict construction of that bond of our Union. He always voted to sustain the rights of the South, and according to Mr. Webster and hundreds of other eminent men among his political opponents, he is as sound concerning the constitutional rights of the South as Mr. Calhoun himself.—Gen. Pierce is an able man and a Statesman, as is proved by his course in Congress and in the Legislature and Convention of his own State, as well as from the fact that he stands at the head of his profession as a Lawyer. Though firm as a rock in his principles, he knows what is due from one freeman to another, and thus instead quarrelling and making enemies of all who come in contact with him, there is no honorable man who knows him that is not his personal friend. If he is elected President the government will be administered in strict accordance with the principles of the constitution, and honesty and economy will take the place of the wild profusion and extravagance which have characterized the present administration.

Such is a brief outline of the character and qualifications of the candidates whose election depends upon our votes. Can any man hesitate which to select? Can any party bind any Southern man to vote for Scott? Will not every